

I am a property owner on a waterway, a riparian zone developer, a wildland restorationist, a sportsman, and a boat sports participant.

House Bill 2351, while with somewhat good intention, limits the rights of many and benefits only a few when using the Willamette River. While the boat sports typically associated with concerns about erosion may create wakes, they are traditionally safer than other higher speed boat sports for all users of waterways. One can understand the people promoting the bill are angry; they are trying to make a change. Unfortunately, the reasons being used for change are unfounded. If any of these people truthfully answered why they want this bill, the answer would be different than what you are being told.

Wake based watersports create a wake of varying size that washes ashore during the few months that the weather is conducive to the sport. However, this is only a few months out of the entire 12 month year. A far more destructive (and natural power) is the high water runoff. The yearly high water runoff does far more damage to personal property and produces both significant erosion and redeposition of soil and other materials. The comparison to the damage done by boats (all boats combined) is negligible to the damage caused by nature.

Boat sports typically do not impact fish and wildlife. The primary times for annual fish migrations don't typically coincide with any significant boat sports use at any measurable level. Only some disruption to "water weeds" may occur in shallow areas during low water times.

If the fact that nature does far more erosion to the shore than boat sports doesn't help understand the size of the "problem"; how about the actual hours of impact?

$365 \text{ days in a year} \times (33\% \text{ (boat sports usable months at 4 months)}) \times (28\% \text{ (Most traffic on Saturdays and Sundays)}) = 33.726 \text{ total days of any reasonable traffic. This is only } 9.24\% \text{ of the days of an entire year.}$

Further, boating mainly happens from about 10 AM until dusk on the usable days; use 10 hours a day. Therefore, $33.726 \times 10 = 337.26 \text{ total hours (Boating days} \times \text{hours of boating} = \text{total hours)}$ And finally, $337.26 / (365 \times 24) = 3.85\% \text{ of the total hours in a year. Even doubling this number is small in comparison to the amount of time the water is working moving and depositing materials (8760 hours a year).}$

A logical conclusion is interested parties promoting and implementing this bill are a small class while the group negatively impacted would be far greater. There are many more boat owners and river users than there are property owners adjacent to the Willamette (or any other waterway large enough to support power boating). The rivers are a public space that is usable to all as-is. Managing any proposed process for wake energy reduction is fraught with issues and of lower overall public value.

The existing waterway traffic and speed control methods should continue to be used and no new rules, regulations, or zones being created. Funding for any further efforts toward passing a bill of this nature should be immediately directed toward groups which will benefit in larger numbers. Efforts such as fish restocking, tributary riparian spawning areas, re-naturalization of the Willamette Falls former industrial areas, etc.

The state has higher priorities (or should) than working bills that have only a small beneficial public effect.